

## REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being fully met by Harris et al., Miller or Bjelkhagen, while claim 33 was only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, in the present set of amended claims, claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled.

As far as claim 33 is concerned, since claim 33 was previously depending upon claim 31, which was depending upon claim 25, which is an allowed claim, claim 33 has been rendered dependent upon claim 25, and claim 33 has been rewritten to include not only the limitation of claim 31, but also, as an alternative, the limitation of claim 32, since the concerned "covering layer" is usable in both cases. Further, claim 33 has been clarified in that the "covering layer" is applied after UV irradiation. This complies with what is already mentioned in method claim 13.

It is believed that the above amendments should not raise new matters for the Examiner and, accordingly, Applicants request entry of the foregoing claim amendments under Rule 116, followed by allowance of amended claim 33.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Clifford W. Browning  
Reg. No. 32,201  
Krieg DeVault LLP  
One Indiana Square, Suite 2800  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 238-6203